



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Biblical Notes.

The Historic Relation of the Gospel. A recent writing by Rev. J. J. Halcombe on this subject undertakes to re-establish the theory of Tertullian regarding the origin of the four Gospels. It is an entire reversal of the prevailing conception. The main points of the theory are thus given in the *Expository Times*: (1) it repudiates the antithesis commonly made between the Synoptic Gospels and John. (2) It contends that the so-called Fourth Gospel was actually the first, and was composed at a very early date. (3) St. Matthew wrote to supplement or expand the history recorded by his brother apostle, and St. Mark added new details to the two previous records. (4) St. Luke closed the Gospel canon by rearranging the incidents which his predecessors had committed to writing, as his preface states. (5) The inter-relation of the four narratives is the result of an affixed principle that there shall be no repetition except for a purpose, and then the later writer shall use the exact words of the earlier as far as the purpose of repetition admits. The author endeavors to support this hypothesis by historic evidence, of which there is very little; and by internal evidence, the phenomena of the Gospels themselves, which he believes much more explicable on the basis of this theory. It is quite doubtful, however, whether the relation of the Gospels advocated by Mr. Halcombe can be made out; and also whether, if it could, it would lend any real aid in the solution of Gospel problems. It would seem that the present conception of the inter-relation, which is the result of the most scholarly investigation and reflection, is the best which the evidence available can be made to produce.

The Synoptic Gospels and John. In a discussion of the chronology of the Synoptic Gospels compared with that of John, especially on the date of the Crucifixion, Professor Sanday argued in a paper in the *Expositor*, Jan. 1892, that the expressions in John such as "eat the Passover," "preparation" etc., could be interpreted so as to harmonize with the statements in the other Gospel. But in the March number of the same journal he prints a letter from Dr. Hort, the great New Testament textual critic, presenting a different view. Dr. Hort concludes from studies in Talmudic antiquities that the explanations of these phrases in John given by Edersheim, whom Sanday follows, are not tenable. Dr. Hort adds, and his words carry weight and are of the greatest interest to New Testament students; "I feel sure that St. John meant to place the Crucifixion on Nisan 14 and that he may safely be trusted here, more especially as this chronology is supported by often-noticed details in the Synoptic accounts. But I am by no means so confident as to the interpretation of the Synoptic chronology. The most obvious, and perhaps the most probable, view is that St. John is tacitly but deliberately correcting an error of the Synoptics. But the greatness of the supposed error is very perplexing if any of the Twelve had any part in the redaction of any one of the three Gospels. . . . I think there is real force in what Westcott urges (*Introd.* p. 344) against treating the Synoptic language as due to mere blunder or fiction, though I cannot be as hopeful as he seems to be that fuller knowledge would justify it in all particulars." And Dr. Sanday adds, "I would gladly express